

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM.]

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."—Paul.

[PAYABLE AT THE END OF SIX MONTHS.]

VOL. III.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1823.

No. 15.

EVANGELICAL.

SCRIPTURAL ILLUSTRATIONS.....No. IX.

PART IV.

When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. . . . And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.—Matt. xxv. 31—46.

Readers that have followed us in this illustration with proper care and patience, need not to be informed, that the 46th verse in the above passage, conveys the same meaning, though in different phraseology, as do the 34th and 41st verses. The phrase *everlasting punishment* is synonymous with *everlasting fire*; and the *life eternal* answers to the *kingdom prepared* for them. The words "kingdom of God," and "kingdom of heaven," were a popular expression for the coming and reign of Jesus. Introductory to the dispensation of infinite mercy through Christ, John the Baptist preached, "saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. iii. 2. And we are informed that "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel."—Mark i. 14, 15. The reign of Jesus in teaching the true character of his Father, may have been represented by a *kingdom*, on account of the prevailing opinion among the Jews, that the Messiah would assume the right of temporal dominion, and redeem them as a people, from the oppressions of the Roman government. And we should naturally conclude that the Evangelists or historians, in recording the sayings of Christ, would be likely to use the language to which they were accustomed, and employ those popular phrases that were common to their countrymen. They probably were not over anxious to report the precise words of the Saviour, if they could but convey his real meaning. In regard to his own character and labors, his meaning evidently was, that the dispensation of mercy and truth, popularly denominated the kingdom of heaven, would commence and be perpetuated through his exertions. Those who received and improved his testimony concerning the character of his Father and ours, would possess that knowledge of the truth, by which they would be made free from the slavery of ignorance and crime. The nature of Christ's kingdom was but partially understood by his immediate followers. They retained so many early impressions, that they continued to look for something like a *worldly kingdom*. Their aspirations to eminence, in disputing who should be greatest, savored much of expectations relative to temporal promotion. Notwithstanding the extraordinary pains taken by their Master, to hold forth his government as being of a spiritual and heavenly nature, yet, his inspired and best informed followers were disappointed and confounded when he was crucified. They forsook him, retired for secret consultation, and were upbraided for their unbelief and hardness of heart. Though they were in the kingdom, and the kingdom of heaven was in them, they did not realize their situation. The peculiar turn of expression, of *inheriting the kingdom of God, or of entering into life*, may denote that experimental confirmation and enjoyment in the truth, at a moment of imminent danger or unprecedented trial, in which the truth exhibits its real value. And on the other hand, the *going away* into punishment, will not imply that those characters were not before miserable on account of their misconduct; but, that they did not before suffer to so great a degree, or so fully realize the cause of their sufferings. It is common for men to attribute their miseries, to any thing, but their crimes. But when, for having resisted the gospel with obstinacy, it is taken from them and granted to others, there is a certain propriety, in representing

them as going away into a dispensation of *restraint* or punishment. Though men are *individually* concerned in the separation of characters, there appears to be a direct allusion to *national* characters. As mankind are frequently represented under the names of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, perhaps that may be a reason for the expression, "all nations were gathered, before him." The meaning might be, that all, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, even as *nations*, were concerned in the events of his coming. This harmonizes with the saying of Jesus; "Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, (the *Jews*) and given to a *nation* (the *Gentiles*) bringing forth the fruits thereof."—Matt. xxi. 43. Here is an evident *separation of nations*; the one goes out of the kingdom of God, into a state of restraints and suffering; and the others, the *Gentiles*, enter the kingdom of heaven, or *eternal life*, in a *national* character. Those who had been nominally the *children of God*, and as a *nation* enjoyed his peculiar favors, were cast out of the kingdom; and those who were not his people in that sense, were then called, "the *children of God*." Thus restrained and corrected, they were to see many come from all directions, and sit down in the kingdom of heaven, the gospel dispensation. These things are so consistent, and harmonize so well with the plan of infinite benevolence, as declared in the scriptures, that more need not be said on this subject, was it not for those prejudices, which hold men as in fetters of iron. *Eternal life* is supposed to express the future *immortality* and *beatification* of man; and everlasting punishment is applied to the same state. But the kingdom of God and *eternal life* are synonymous, in the parable; therefore, as we have proved that the kingdom was inherited in this mode of existence, it follows that *eternal life* may be also enjoyed. But the words of Christ are explicit to the point. "Verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." "And this is *life eternal*, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.—John iii. 36; vi. 46; xvii. 3. And the beloved disciple declares, that though "he that hateth his brother is a murderer, and we know that no murderer hath *eternal life abiding* in him," yet "we know we have passed from death unto *life*, because we love the brethren."—1 John iii. 14, 15. This *eternal life* is possessed by every one, who knows God and keeps his commandments; and therefore, the text in question does not relate, exclusively, to a future state. If *eternal life* can be enjoyed here, then certainly, everlasting punishment can be endured here, likewise.

Our opponents admit that the word (*aionion*) rendered *everlasting* and *eternal*, is most frequently used in a limited sense, in the scriptures; that it is found in the *singular* and *plural* numbers; and should not be applied to an eternity of duration, unless the subject necessarily requires it. We need not repeat what has been written and published on this point, by many able advocates for the salvation of the world, nor refer to the particular passages in which *aion*, and its derivatives, *aionion*, *aionios*, &c. are employed by the sacred writers, to express *periods* of limited duration. Nor can it be supposed that many of our readers need be informed, that the same word, when repeated in the same sentence, does not always, convey the same meaning. When it is said, "The *everlasting* mountains were scattered.—His ways are *everlasting*," (Hab. iii. 6) the difference between the *first* and *last* use of the word, is too evident to escape observation.

There is one consideration that should forever silence the advocates for the unlimited definition of the word *everlasting*, in the case in question. They should consider that, if the punishment spoken of, must be endless, because it is called *everlasting*, it will follow, that the possession of Canaan, the covenant of circumcision, and the Levitical priesthood are also endless, and for the same reason; viz.

because they are also said to be everlasting. Hence the very argument which is relied upon to support the doctrine of unending torments, would, if it be valid, furnish the advocates for Judaism, with irresistible weapons against Christianity. We call on the Scribes of modern orthodoxy, to produce an argument in favor of *endless* punishment, from the word in question, that may not be urged with equal propriety and truth, against the Christian dispensation. Are we told that those *everlasting things* had a beginning, and must have an end? The same is equally true of punishment. Must the first priesthood be abolished, that the superior glory and benevolence of God, may be displayed in the second? So must punishment come to an end, that "God may be **ALL IN ALL**." In this manner might we proceed.

There certainly can be no more impropriety in denominating that *administration* of God by which iniquity is restrained, *everlasting punishment*, or *fire*, than to employ the words *everlasting*, *eternal* and *perpetual*, in describing the covenant of circumcision, and the duration of other things which will have an end. It had *always existed* from the sin of Eden, to the coming of the Son of man, as declared in the discourse, of which the parable before us is a part; and has *continued to be* from that great day to the present, and will *ever last* while men are sinners and need correction. Hence it is called *everlasting*. It has existed from *ancient* or *eternal* times. But we are not to infer that each individual, or generation, who was *punished*, are *now* in misery. As well might we contend that each individual that was *circumcised*, lived, during the continuance of the *everlasting covenant* of circumcision. If a prison was now standing, which had *always existed* on the earth, it would be called *everlasting*. But must we conclude that all who had ever been *imprisoned* in it, would remain there as long as the prison should stand? Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities round about, suffered the vengeance of *eternal fire*, when they were destroyed as in a moment, and were *sat forth*, by the apostle, as a warning to others. But they are not now suffering it, since it has long since ceased to exist. The *everlasting fire* was not quenched; it went out of itself.

But there is one argument, which must not be omitted in this place, in favor of the doctrine of benevolence, that none of our adversaries can consistently oppose. It is drawn from the nature and design of punishment as expressed in the text. The word *kolasin*, translated punishment, signifies *restraint*, *chastisement*, *correction*. Now why do not our learned opposers, in their elaborate criticisms in support of *endless misery*, insist on the meaning of the word *kolasin*? The answer is ready. They cautiously avoid this point, because they know it is wholly against their doctrine. They define *everlasting punishment* to be the *full* and *unrestrained indulgence* of a totally corrupt nature, making the sufferer worse and *worse*. This is almost exactly the *reverse* of the real meaning of the word punishment. The one is, to restrain and make better; the other, without restraint, making worse. We hazard nothing, therefore, in asserting, that as the phrase *everlasting punishment*, does not express, neither does it imply, the cruel doctrine of *endless misery*: a doctrine, incompatible with the paternal character of God; at war, with the mediatorial office of Christ, and opposed to the benevolent feelings, desires and prayers of the friends of God and man.

As it ever has been and is now, consistent with divine goodness to restrain or punish the disobedient and unmerciful, for their ultimate emendation, so will it ever continue to be proper to punish in a similar manner, as long as such characters and dispositions remain. We are fully persuaded there can be no more severity in permitting the existence of suffering, to the same extent and for the same benevolent ends, in one state of being than in another. The purposes of Deity are universally and

specially benevolent; therefore, human suffering will not be endless, nor any individual intelligence, have, on the whole, a greater quantum of misery than happiness. Than that statement, no axiom can be more self-evident; consequently, the doctrine of unceasing, infinite torment, is fundamentally and incontrovertibly **ERRONEOUS**. We must reserve a few retrospective and practical remarks for a future paper.

POLEMICAL.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

—
ELM-TREES, Nov. 15, 1823.
TO "PETRUS."

MY DEAR SIR—On my return home a few days since, after an absence of nearly three months, it was among my first thoughts, to look over the "Christian Intelligencer" that had reached my sequestered abode while I was from home; and I was highly gratified with the composition, temper, and general sentiments that breathed in the several publications. I confess your note addressed to me was peculiarly agreeable; and I believe the more so, because my old honest calvinistic friend, whom I shall call Eusebius, since my last letter to him, has almost forsaken me. He has called to see me but once; and that visit was rather formal than social, as our interviews had always been. He was not wanting in expressions of friendship, in which I believe he was very sincere; but he seemed to avoid every attempt, on my part, to enter freely, as we had been wont to do, on the peculiarities of our several modes of religious thinking, or any topic that might lead either of us that way. I have more than once been at his house, and can plainly discover a marked shyness in the whole family, with a guarded course of conversation, as though they feared it should fall on something of a religious nature, and yet they are all very pious and devout members of the church militant. I have heretofore often attended public worship with them; and as often on return home, the prayer, sermon, or hymn that was sung, became the subject of a free, and I always thought a pleasing and instructing conversation. Indeed it really was so to me. Since my last letter every thing of this kind is done away; and I began to fear one of my most pleasing modes of passing a leisure day, afternoon or evening, was lost forever; but I can assure you, the address I am now replying to, promises to supply the place of all I looked on as lost.

I must dissent from those who think that conversation on subjects of religious controversy is rather injurious to piety and the spread of true religious principles than otherwise. For when I look back to almost any past period, and mark the general state of religion, whether in principles or modes of worship, and compare them with the present, I think the change of difference is in favor of the existing state of things; and I have no doubt but the amelioration is brought about as much, if not more, by a free and easy discussion of differences in conversation, as by the more formal mode of communicating the principles of harmony and good understanding among neighbors, in the dissenting states of religion, from the pulpit, or by the press. And when discussions among persons of different religious sentiments fail of this happy effect, I think it must be owing to the unfortunate circumstance, that *personal feeling or some passion* has been permitted to mingle in the debate. Inasmuch as we are rational creatures and *only* to be praised as we advance in reason's course; all personal feeling and the common passions, that are apt to mislead the judgment, must be avoided.

I have noted in myself, on reviewing a controversial conversation, that whenever I could perceive any degree of passion or *personal feeling* had attached to, and mingled with the debate, I always lost the argument. Again I have observed in myself as well as in others, that in all animated debate or conversation the parties or speaker are as much heated by their own words and phrases, as by the language of their antagonists.

I now proceed to the subject of your note, and shall with perfect frankness give you my ideas on some of the topics you call my attention to, whatever the world or you may think of them; if they be *just and correct*, I have no doubt you will approve of them, whatever may have been your previous opinion. If they are not agreeable to reason and scripture rightly interpreted, I do not wish you to; but on the contrary, on being convinced my notions are wrong, and yours right, I will abandon mine and adopt yours; reason demands this, while religion can expect nothing more. I shall wave for a little while any additional ideas on the subject of *Universalism, or the final happiness of all men*, not because I have any doubt of the fact, but because I understand there has lately risen a question among some of this denomination, whether the *punishment* for sins is exclusively confined to this world, or extends and will be felt in the resurrection state, as a diminution of the general happiness of sinners, and in the character of *chastisements* of our heavenly Father's love, and means to prepare the subjects for greater purity and their final happiness. Now the leaning of my mind has been, for more than forty years in concordance with the latter opinion; but my mind is open to arguments; and I am not willing to close it in this state, by a decision, before I have heard more on this point; and yet the decision seems to me of no great importance; because it is a question about a matter of

fact; and whether the one statement or the other be proved true, we can have no doubt but it will fully appear to all practical purposes, that sin is equally odious, and the sinner will be duly punished or chastised.

You say, "I have intimated, that I intended to give the natural import of Christ's words at the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper; and what effect he designed they should have on the minds of his disciples." And then add, "If the design was as Mr. Murray thought, to remember Jesus every time we eat bread or drink wine, why not make a sacrament of washing our hands or using a towel, and every thing else which Jesus did, as setting an example?" "Is it not as proper to have a religious celebration once a week, or once a month, as to have an annual celebration of Saint John's day, or the birth of our nation? Perhaps by this means we shall oftener and more heartily think of the suffering Saviour, when not partaking of the sacrament."

You will recollect I stated some ancient customs among the Jews at their greater and lesser feasts, which probably extended and were observed at the regular dining and supping parties. I referred to my authorities, which carried us back to a period a century or two before the birth of Jesus; from all which I drew this inference, viz. "that the facts constituting the elements of what is called the Eucharist, or Lord's supper, are not, properly speaking, of divine original;" because they made no part of the paschal supper as it was instituted by Moses! and I might have added, *I do not recollect* of any interposition, by order of Jehovah, to add to the materials of that supper, in any after Revelation, so as to place the *sending round bread and wine, in the manner it was then done and exactly in conformity with the then ancient custom*, on the same footing with the other parts of the original institution. We have no evidence that Jesus gave orders for bread and wine, when the disciples went to make ready for the passover; or any intimation that he was about to institute a *rite, ordinance or memorial relative to himself*. For aught appears, the keeping a passover, as it had usually been observed, was all that was thought of by Jesus, or his disciples; indeed we can't well suppose it possible for the latter to have thought of any thing else; and is it not certain that as Jesus and his disciples were attending to a Jew feast, this little group observed and kept it in all respects as other little collections of Jews did? I allude now to the *actions* of Jesus as the master of the ceremony, and the *mere corporeal elements of the feast*; or that part of it which is supposed to constitute the *Eucharist or Lord's supper*. The words that Jesus spake when he sent round the wine and bread were probably novel; though there is no evidence that they made any noticeable impression on the minds of his disciples, as did his suggestion that one of them would betray him.

At the commencement of the paschal supper Jesus took a cup of wine and passed it round to his disciples; and so did all other leaders in the ceremony to those who were his guests or company. During the paschal supper, Jesus took bread, brake and gave it to his disciples; and so did all others who presided over separate companies: Again, after, or at the close of the paschal supper, Jesus took the cup and gave it to his disciples; and so did others. Thus far from the facts, I see no ground to infer an intention to make a new, or to change an old institution, *rite, ceremony or ordinance*.

Should you demand why I have assented that others who presided over other companies, small or great, took wine and bread, and passed them round to the guests, as Jesus did, seeing the Evangelists relate no such thing of them; I answer, because, if the history, I have referred to, be correct, the facts or elements referred to were attended to as a general custom at the passover and other feasts, or actually amalgamated as a constituent part of the feast, and all were observing the same feast. Let us now attend to what Jesus said while he was actually performing the acts which are said to constitute the *Eucharist or Lord's supper*; because declarations, or even single words spoken at the performance of an action, may fully explain the *motive object and intention* of him who does the act. "And when the hour was come He sat down and the twelve disciples with him. And he said unto them, with desire I have desired to eat *this passover with you before I suffer*. For I say unto you I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." This exordium was probably a novelty to the company: But I do not perceive any allusion to a new *rite, ceremony or ordinance*, differing from what they were then observing. Does it not imply, and would not his disciples naturally conclude, that He would thereafter, the particular time uncertain, eat the *passover again with them*? "And He took the cup and gave thanks and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." Does not this too seem to imply that at some future period he should keep the passover, or drink wine with them? Could the minds of the disciples, according to the ordinary anticipation of one thing from another, be led to any thing else? "And he took bread and gave thanks, and break it and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." I have cited the actions and words of Jesus as recorded by Luke, because he is more full than either of the other evangelists; and because he only has recorded the words that can be construed into evidence of an intention or expectation of Jesus that the acts then done by him should ever be repeated as a right, custom or ordinance. Having observed that what Jesus did is probably nothing different from what was usual to be done at this and other feasts, and what was then doing by

others throughout the city of Jerusalem, all which affords no evidence of an intention to abolish or alter an old, or introduce a new *rite, ceremony or ordinance*; we are brought to consider the import of his words and declarations, as he performed the several actions mentioned; for on this the argument, I think, must turn. The accounts I have met with in history concerning the custom of sending round wine and bread, at the feasts of the Jews and other nations, are not so full and satisfactory as to what was said, and sentiments expressed, by the governor of the feast at those times. Admitting then that the custom extended only to the sending round bread and wine, we might say that Jesus was original as to what he said; but not as to what he did. It would then seem to me that when Jesus took the bread or wine, and observed, *this is my body, this is my blood, &c. eat it and drink it*. This do in remembrance of me; A question naturally occurs, viz. do what in remembrance of him? Why the answer is, just what He and they, the disciples, were then doing. And what was that? Answer, 1st. generally, they may be said to be keeping or eating the passover, or eating the paschal supper: Or, 2dly. they may be said to be in the *act of attending to the mere elements of a general custom*, usually, if not universally, and for a long time, associated with, if not amalgamated into and made part of the paschal supper itself: Or, 3dly, it may mean something more particular yet; it may refer and apply to what the disciples did, at Jesus, saying, *this do in remembrance of me*. And what was that? simply *eating the bread handed to them during the paschal supper*. Now if we apply the supposed injunction, *this do in remembrance of me*, to the first case, there will be no Eucharist or Lord's supper, different from the passover or paschal supper; which is an annual feast and its object well known. But if we adopt the second case, and apply the injunction *this do in remembrance of me*, to the sending round bread and wine at feasts and regular dining and supping parties, there would rarely happen an opportunity for keeping the Eucharist or Lord's supper according to its original institution—because I have no evidence that the Jews ever performed the actions that Jesus did, and which constitute the Eucharist, but as they were accompanied or attendant upon some feast or regular dining and supping parties. It would resemble a quality or attribute without the substance, a shadow when there was no interposing body. It may here be asked, allowing all that has been said about the origin of the custom of eating bread and drinking wine at feasts, at the passover, and at family parties, might not Jesus designly have separated them, and did he not do it by what he said at the last passover? This question will be noticed under another head of your note. Should we be satisfied with the third and last alternative of the question, which I am inclined to think was the understanding of Mr. Murray, and my friends the Quakers, then every time we set at the table, and see bread and wine, or whatever may be the common beverage, handed round to us to eat and drink, to all such cases the injunction attaches, and it becomes the duty of christians duly to improve it. Had Jesus said to his disciples go and prepare some *bread and wine that we may eat and drink together* before I take my leave of you, instead of ordering them to make ready the passover, there would be some ground on which the general mode of observing the Lord's supper, as it is now attended, might be argued. Even then it might be a question, whether the *spirituality* of the religion of Jesus would not rebut the idea of its being in any sense connected with mere rites, ceremonies and ordinances? And would it not be more rational and consistent with his simplicity, that he should so *deliver the bread and wine*, which was then a custom connected with eating and feasting that ordinarily come round in the business of life once or twice a day, to his *disciples, as to make a deep impression*, which with his declaration must so associate *himself* with the whole complex transaction, that, on all future occasions, the *like acts of passing round bread and wine*, would necessarily bring him, in all his offices, to the minds of his disciples? It appears to me the object Jesus had in view, was to do something then which should always, or as often as the ordinary business of mortal life would admit remind his disciples of *him, THEIR MASTER*; even against their wills; that is, whether they were voluntarily, from minute to minute, making an effort to keep up the remembrance of him or not. If Jesus in his offices is actually in our minds, what is the benefit of going to a particular place, at certain intervals of time, and there in his name eating a piece of bread or drinking a cup of wine? A reply to this question must lead to an history of the corruptions of the Lord's supper, which commenced very soon after the ascension of our Lord, and continued down to the present time. And I will conclude, by observing, it seems to me, my idea on this subject is confirmed by what took place between Jesus and some of his disciples, the next day after his resurrection. We are told in the 24th chapt. of Luke, that as two of his disciples were walking to Emmaus, Jesus joined in their company, though they did not recollect him. On reaching the village he went in with them; and at supper Jesus *took bread, broke and blessed it, handed it to his guests at an ordinary supper; and immediately the acts and words of Jesus brought him to their remembrance, and they knew him*. This was undoubtedly the natural effect of the great and important law of association, by which Jesus intended to rest upon for keeping himself in the minds of his sleepy, slow-of-heart and forgetful disciples. This was a first, and a proper Lord's supper. There was no previous thinking of Jesus, and in consequence of this forethought, bread and wine, brought to a designated place and at an appointed time, and an assembling of the disciples, to shew to the world that they had not forgot their Lord and master. But while he was no: in their thoughts, and engaged in a common and frequent

event of life, Jesus was forced upon their minds. And I hazard nothing in saying, they never sat down at a feast or ordinary meal, but Jesus was in their minds, to the end of their lives. With this view of the subject the disciples for some time continued in the Temple service, and *breaking bread from house to house*; as I understand the phrase—when they dined or supped at each others or their friends houses, they did what Jesus did at the passover, and again at the village of Emmaus.

I did not intend this letter should have been half so long: but I don't compel you to read the whole of it at once. I shall give you my ideas on the other parts of your note, as I have leisure.

I am dear sir, your friend and obedient servant,
NAZARENUS.

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, DEC. 6, 1823.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

To the Publisher of the Christian Mirror,

Mr. SHIRLEY.—As you are a professor of the Calvinist religion and the publisher of a religious paper, you probably hold yourself responsible to the public, as well as to the church to which you belong, for the disposition and motives by which you are influenced in your conduct; and if so, you will be ready to answer a few plain and friendly questions in relation to the feelings which you expressed, a few days since, towards the final happiness of all mankind. You will discover, Sir, by the following statement, which is received from too respectable a source, to admit of contradiction, that a settled enmity to the salvation of your fellow-sinners has excited that attention which the importance of the doctrine you opposed demanded.

"Mr. SHIRLEY declared, a few days since, in conversation with a gentleman on the subject of Universal Salvation, that there was not a *single sentence, word nor syllable* in the bible, which favored that doctrine: and when passages were mentioned and arguments pressed upon him, which he could neither deny nor gainsay, Mr. Shirley solemnly declared that if he thought there was *one word* in his bible, favorable to the salvation of all men, he would discard the bible and throw it aside, as unworthy the least attention. Should you see fit, Mr. Editor, to publish the above with your remarks, you would gratify

CANDOUR."

We deem it most neighborly and proper to address you in an affectionate manner on this painfully important subject. Is it possible, Mr. Shirley, that as a member of a christian church, or even as a member of the great family of man, you could have deliberately expressed so unkind a sentiment? If you value your bible, only as it confirms you in the notion of endless misery, and if you would discard that sacred book did it favor the final end of all sin and all suffering, does it not follow of course, that you are friendly to the continuance of sin and the perpetuity of misery? If you spoke the sentiment of your heart, (and from the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh,) are you not an enemy to the future well-being of a part of the human family? We are sorry to be under the necessity of exposing a temper of mind so unworthy of the christian name. Do pause, dear sir, and reflect on the spirit by which you were dictated. Do you know what manner of spirit you are of? Are you unwilling that all men should be *saved from sin and unholiness*? Would you despise your bible did it favor the salvation of all sinners? Are you so pleased with iniquity, and consequent misery, that you desire their endless continuance? We hope you will not persist in such an unchristian disposition. It is not enmity, but friendship and pity, that dictates these remarks.

You assert, dear sir, that there is not *a word* in your bible which favors the final happiness of all men. Will you be so kind as to read with attention the "Christian Optimator," published on the last page of this day's paper; and if the passages there criticised are directly *against* our doctrine, inform us wherein. To quote a few passages only, which speak the salvation of all men, as though the scriptures did not abound with them, would be to insult all readers of common discernment and candor. But should you be convinced, as you certainly will, if you read with care, that the bible favors the merciful doctrine which you despise, do not discard and throw it aside, but read in future with more attention, and exhibit a better disposition towards your fellow-creatures.

FORMING CHARACTERS FOR ETERNITY.

In a former number we suggested a few things for the consideration of Calvinists, in relation to forming characters in this world, for eternity. We now resume the subject for the examination of such as are favorable to Arminian sentiments. They maintain that christians are capable of arriving to a state of sinless perfection, in this life; and that some of them *actually do* attain to entire sanctification, and live for months and years without committing sin. The number of such, however, is extremely small. But they hold there are christians of all grades, from *perfect* sanctification, to the *lowest* degree of grace, which entitles a professor to the character of a christian. Now if we admit this doctrine, to what does it amount, but, that there will be just as great a difference of characters among such christians, to eternity, as there is in the present life? If they are rewarded according to their works, or different degrees of holiness, there will be as great a difference of condition, between the *perfectly* sanctified, and such as are *barely* converted without a growth in grace, as between those *converts*, and the *most upright* of such as were never converted at all. For certainly, in this world, where they form their characters, a perfect saint is as much above a mere christian, as the latter is above a moralist, "who never experienced religion."

According to that sentiment the righteous will be no more holy in the future world, than they are in this; and, on the other hand, the wicked will be no worse. If there is no alteration after death, then, *a few* will be *perfectly*, *some partly*, and others *less* holy, to eternity! Would the advocates for this strange doctrine be willing to apply it, on trying occasions? Do they visit the chamber of dying christians and attempt to console them by saying, 'Just as your characters have been in this world, such they will be forever' and in proportion to your holiness here, will your happiness be in eternity? They surely do not. Their conduct is at variance with their doctrine. Arminian ministers, as well as others, endeavor to encourage their departing brethren, though they have made but little proficiency in sanctification, to look for an immediate emancipation from the bondage of sin and the influence of temptation. They exhort them to look for perfect holiness and happiness. We hazard nothing in saying, that every real christian hopes to become much *holier*, and consequently *happier*, in eternity, than in the present world. Who, but pharisees in good earnest, would be willing to believe that the holiness acquired in this imperfect life, would entitle them to the felicities of a blissful immortality? Blessed be God, that which is sown in dishonor shall be raised in glory.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

We consider the controversy between S. S. and T. closed, and therefore decline publishing any more on either side, unless something new and conclusive may be presented. However as we have before us a communication from each of these correspondents, a word of explanation may be proper.

There is certainly no necessity for publishing T's last reply; since it is a mere recapitulation of the points of argument already published in this controversy. Therefore, we prefer putting such of our readers, as consider the controversy sufficiently interesting, to the trouble of reviewing and re-examining for themselves, rather than to insert again what has been repeated in our columns.

A considerable part of the reply from S. S. also consists of *recapitulatory* remarks, and may be dispensed with for reasons already given. But there are a few sentences concerning the present state of the controversy, to which the public are entitled. The words are,

"That sin *itself*, the subject on which I commenced writing, is *not* infinite, T. admits. In this, then, we are perfectly agreed. But T. has introduced another subject, viz. that sin, which *in itself* and in its *nature*, is *finite*, has, by accident assumed an infinite character, and become thereby an infinite evil. Now it belongs to him to PROVE this proposition if he can."

These observations are incontrovertible; and the 'laboring oar' is in T's hands. He is at liberty to produce a "thus saith the Lord" for the *infinite character* of a *finite nature*, and we will publish it. But we shall not fill our columns with *unproved assertions*, *re-asserted*. If sin is infinite in its character, because the character of God is infinite, then it is also infinite in its nature, because God's nature is infinite. If desiring the non-existence of an infinite Being, confers the character of infinity on the act, then, of course, to desire the destruction of an omnipotent being, would impart the character of omnipotence. The same would be true of *omniscience*, *invisibility*, *eternity*, &c.

But we must so far retract from our former resolutions, as to inform friend T. that we feel somewhat injured by the implication of his arguments. He knows we confess our sins, saying, "God be merciful to me a *sinner*." But does that sinner desire the destruction of the merciful Being to whom he prays? How is it with T. himself? Is he *also* a sinner? and does he desire the annihilation of infinite good? We hope better things of him. So far as the charge concerns the *writer* of these remarks, it is *radically false*. He never "desired, wished, nor designed such an event." He would contradict so slanderous an assertion, though made by his *Holiness of Rome*, or "even an angel from heaven." It is not found in Paul's gospel, and ought therefore to be discredited by all rational Christians.

"EXAMINER" has been under consideration. We have carefully perused the article on the "Doctrine of Endless Misery," found in our paper of "July 5," to which "Examiner" alludes. On critical examination we do not perceive that "S. S" was arguing either of the *points*, enumerated in the communication before us. Those observations which are arranged as separate propositions by "Examiner," were merely introductory to the principal points of the article examined. It would therefore be improper to divert the attention of our readers from the main argument, to occasional remarks. The argument to which we allude is, substantially this, viz. Infinitely important as the doctrine of endless misery must be to every individual of the human family, if true, we have reason to suppose that it would have been taught with the greatest possible clearness and precision. The sacred writers would have been as well understood, in support of that doctrine, as Luther, Calvin, Edwards, Emmons, and many others are. Now, if Examiner will expose any unsoundness or fallacy in the main argument, we will cheerfully publish it. But we might as well engage to reprint, what has a thousand times been published by Papal and Protestant doctors, who are pleasantly agreed in the charming doctrine of endless torment, as to obligate ourselves to publish all that our correspondent might see fit to present, in support of the same unmerciful tenet.

TO OUR PATRONS.

Subscribers who have complied with the terms of our paper will accept our warmest thanks. Agents at a distance in this State, and subscribers in towns where there is no agent, will in a few days have a convenient opportunity to make us remittances by the Members of the Legislature, which we hope they will not fail to do. Those living out of the State, will make payment to the nearest agent, or if more convenient, remit it by mail, *post paid*, to the Editor.

AGENTS FOR THE INTELLIGENCER.

MAINE.

Anson—Hon. J. Collins, P.M. Hope—W. Sweetland, Esq. P.M.
Augusta—John Reed. Levant—Edmund B. Baw.
Brunswick—G. W. Holden. Lewiston—D. Read, Esq. P.M.
Belfast—Dr. J. P. Alden. Litchfield—David Burr, Esq.
Bangor—N. Bean. Livermore—Dr. E. Bradford.
Bangor—N. Bean. Buckfield—Capt. A. Parsons.
Bath—Nath'l Swasey. Minot & Poland—J. Bartlett.
Cumden—Lewis Ogier. N. Gloucest'r—M. Bennett, 3d.
Canton—Hon. C. Holland. New Sharon—O. Gould.
Castine—Samuel Mendum. Norway—J. Bartlett.
Canaan—Joseph Barrett. Nor. Bridgton—N. Howe, Esq.
Durham—Job Sylvester, P.M. Paris—Rev. A. Barton.
Eddington—Right Stockwell. Readfield—J. Smith, Esq.
Farmington—Rev. W. A. Drew. Saco—E. S. Moulton.
Falmouth—John Wait, Esq. Turner—Col. Cyrus Clark,
Fairfield—Levi Barrett, Esq. Union—Dr. E. Harding.
Freeport—Joseph Mitchell. Waterville—Rev. S. Cobb.
Gray—John Stimpson. Westbrook—Amasa Fobes.
Gardiner—Parker Sheldon. Winthrop—Seth May.
Green—L. Robbins, Esq. P.M. Wales—Jonathan Plummer,
NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Kingston—D. Bartlett, Esq. Portsmouth—Rev. S. Streeter.
Langdon—Rev. D. Skinner. Richmond—J. Bisbe, P. M.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Amesbury—Philip Osgood. Salem—Rev. B. Streeter.
Dunstable—Samuel Roby. Westminster—Rev. L. Briggs.
Plymouth—W. Brown, P. M. Haverhill—Moses Ross.

VERMONT.

Barre—Rev. J. E. Palmer. Mt. Holly—D. Green, P. M.
Bethel—Rev. K. Haven. Springfield—L. Walker, Esq.
Halifax—H. H. Winchester. Townshend—A. Doolittle, Esq.
Hartland—Rev. R. Bartlett.

RHODE ISLAND.

Providence—S. W. Wheeler. Hartford—Rev. R. Cartique.
NEW-YORK.

Hoosick—Dr. A. Armstrong, P.M. New York—S. Woodworth.

MARRIED.

In this town, by Rev. Mr. Ripley, Mr. Rufus Beale, to Miss Jane Haynes.

In Westbrook, on Monday evening last, by Rev. Dr. Nichols, Mr. HENRY MERRILL, Deputy Collector of this port, to Miss ALMIRA, daughter of James Deering, Esq.

DIED.

In this town, Mrs. Hannah Hussey, aged 60. Mrs. Keziah Pineo, aged 81.
In York, Mr. Daniel M'Intire, aged 74.

POETRY.

THE CHRISTIAN'S PRAYER.

Great Architect, of worlds on worlds,
That roll in realms of day;
Thy servants bend th' adoring knee,
And thus, they humbly pray:

Imprint those truths thy word reveals,
On every christian's heart;
And give us love supreme, for thee,
And love, to all mankind.

And with that love, O give the church
A heart which feels for woe;
And nerve the arm, whose lib'ral hand
Forbids the tear to flow.

Then widows, orphans, strangers, poor,
Shall shout aloud for joy;
And gratitude to God and man,
They happy hours employ.

Salvation then, from pole to pole,
Shall swell the choral strain;
And all the church pronounce, as one,
So mote it be, Amen!

SKETCH PREACHER, NO. 2.

Philippians i. 18—"What then? notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and I will rejoice."

The christian church at Phillipi was the first established upon the continent of Europe. Here Paul and Silas were instrumental in removing the mental disorder of a damsel, "who brought her masters much gain by soothsaying," Acts xvi. 16. In consequence of this benevolent deed, they were arrested by the Roman authorities, cruelly beaten, and "thrust into prison with their feet made fast in the stocks." But induced by a wonderful interposition of divine power, the magistrates brought them out of the prison, and desired them to leave the city. Being thus honorably liberated by the civil rulers, "they comforted the brethren and departed for Thessalonica." During this visit of the Apostle at Phillipi, he first disseminated the sublime principles of christianity. In demonstration of the spirit, and with power, he preached the gospel of Christ, in its simplicity, purity and efficacy. After his departure, various teachers labored among the brethren. Some endeavored to intermix the ceremonies of Judaism, and others the rites of the gentiles, with the doctrine inculcated by the Apostle, who preached "Christ and him crucified only." Some who were really sincere in preaching Christ, still thought that useful additions might be made to his doctrine. Others made use of the name of Christ merely as a pretence, that they might the more successfully display their talents to the detriment of St. Paul. Hence he says, "The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds; but the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel." Many envied the brilliant success of the Apostle, and assumed the profession of christianity, in order to effect his humiliation, and increase his afflictions by an artful introduction of anti-christian doctrines. Though a prisoner at Rome, Paul was well acquainted with the movements and transactions of these teachers. Devoted as he was to the propagation of the gospel unadulterated by the traditions of men, and unembellished by human ingenuity, such conduct, we should naturally suppose, would have drawn from the apostle direct animadversion. We should anticipate reproof to the authors of it in terms the most open and severe. But how differently does he express himself. What sweetness, what heavenly mildness flow through his periods. "Whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and I will rejoice." How happy would it have been for mankind, if this temper had influenced the conduct of preachers and professors through the successive ages of the christian Church. What enmity and violence, disorder and bloodshed, persecutions and miseries, what dishonor to man, what disgrace to the christian name would have been prevented. How many flood-gates of ungodliness and impurity it would have closed, and what sources of social virtue, of "peace on earth, and good will towards men," it would have opened. The general prevalence of this truly christian disposition would, in every age, have done much at least, towards silencing effectually, the sneer of the infidel, and the scoff of the worldling. It would have rendered the disciples of the harmless Redeemer, "fruitful in every good word and work." It would have aided them in their efforts to "depart from all iniquity, to be holy as their Master was holy," and to know experimentally, "how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." And here let me observe that the salutary effects of this temper in the apostolic age, would attend it at the present day, were it generally exercised among those "who have named the name of Christ." There never perhaps, was a time when the exemplification of such a peaceful and generous disposition was more necessary to the repose and happiness of society. There certainly never was a period when it would appear more lovely, or operate to greater advantage. Christendom throngs with sectaries. Those who, "with their mouths confess the Lord Jesus, and believe in their hearts that God hath raised him from the dead," are di-

vided and sub-divided into an almost numberless variety of denominations, who entertain different views of some essential or circumstantial articles in the general scheme of christianity. Among every order there are some at least, who attach a high importance not only to the fundamental principles of their creed, but to the more trivial points of it. From his Holiness, who professes to hold the keys of St. Peter, down to the peaceable and unassuming Quaker, who silently awaits the movements of the spirit, all feel a conscious claim to truth, if not to infallibility. They of course preach differently, though all profess to preach Christ. Some among all orders are doubtless sincere, and others enter the vineyard from motives which are not commendable. "Some preach Christ in pretence only, and others in truth." Among such a number of variant systems as are now prevalent, all cannot, we must admit, be founded on truth; and without a supernatral interposition, we cannot expect a very speedy termination of the existing diversity of religious opinions. How then shall we conduct ourselves? Shall we waste our time in useless lamentations, in contention, and bitter recriminations? or shall we imitate the great apostle of the gentiles, and "rejoice notwithstanding every way, whether it be in pretence or in truth, that Christ is preached?" We have the same reasons to rejoice that he had, and his were powerful ones. In either case Christ is at least, nominally preached, and this is incomparably more salutary to society, than the promulgation of any other system of religion, even in its spirituality and perfection. The least glimpse of "the gospel of God our Saviour," is unspeakably preferable to a perfect knowledge of every other system of doctrine; and wherever its faintest beams are imparted, it will ultimately arise to its meridian splendor. It will dispel the darkness, and "light with the light of life, every man that cometh into the world." The enlightened christian will therefore "live peaceably with all men," and rejoice in every attempt to preach Christ, whether it be done in pretence or in truth. Let us briefly attend to a few, among the many reasons, which may be offered in favor of such a course. And, 1. The evils inseparable from the numberless corruptions and abuses of christianity, are overbalanced by the blessings attendant upon its general influence, and occasional revivals of its primitive truths. The assumption of the christian profession by the Roman Pontiffs, in order to gratify their pride, ambition and avarice, was more beneficial to the world, than a total renunciation of the name of Christ would have been. The multitude were, for a time, denied the use of the sacred volume, doomed to grope in darkness; but by their spiritual oppressors it was carefully kept in existence. In due time a watchful providence raised up a Wickliff, a Luther and others, to open to the view of the world a portion of its heavenly treasures. Had no pretences been made to the gospel, in what are properly termed the dark ages, the scriptures might have been lost, but they were preserved by those, who preached Christ in pretence only, and we have at length learned the "great and precious promises" they contain. 2. The christian religion perverted to a mere state establishment, and preached simply to subserve the ends of civil government, or to aggrandize and enrich a ruling dynasty, is vastly preferable to any theory adopted by heathen nations. In the propagation of such a scheme of nominal christianity, the lover of Jesus will rejoice. He will indulge the well grounded expectation, that ere long his Master will qualify a dissenter to rectify existing errors and abuses, and a puritan to revive the ancient purity of discipline and morals in the church of God. We can rejoice in the spiritual tyranny of the church of England, when we consider that it opened the way for the settlement of this happy country, for that high degree of religious and civil liberty, and those liberal, rational and delightful views of God and his moral government, which we now enjoy. 3. The different sentiments which have prevailed in the world with respect to the person and mission of Christ, and the final result of his mediation, have served to keep alive a spirit of inquiry and watchfulness. They have led to critical and patient investigation. They have opened sources of science, of literature, and of useful knowledge, which without them, would never have been explored. The abettors of opposite opinions are, in some degree, efficient checks to the vicious propensities, and regulators to the lives of each other. In this way, even enmity may do the offices of friendship, and conflicting opinions subserve a common interest. The various ways, therefore, in which Christ is preached, are favorable to the progress of the human mind in knowledge and virtue. 4. The enlightened christian may respond the sentiment of the text with respect to the numerous sectaries now prevalent in Christendom. He will rejoice in the exertions for the spread of christianity, however variant their views of it may be. Notwithstanding every way, Christ is preached, at least measurably. All have some knowledge of the adorable Redeemer of the world. All inculcate some of the essential articles in "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." If they know Christ but in part, if they can teach the first letter only, in the alphabet of christianity, it is matter of joy. The great teacher will in due time rectify every mistake, and remove every error from the minds of his pupils. He will ultimately cause his "watchmen to see eye to eye, and to lift up their voices together." Under his care and tuition, we shall grow in grace, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

True cheerfulness makes a man happy in himself, and promotes the happiness of all around him. It is the clear and calm sunshine of a mind illuminated by piety and virtue.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

CHRISTIAN OPTULATOR,

No. XII.

"For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. v. 19.

In quoting this text to limitarians, I have generally observed, that they were disposed to take advantage of the word "many," and hence deny the universality of its signification. Our brethren of the Calvinistic denomination, contend that "many" (especially in the latter clause of the verse) signifies the elect; and the Arminians, also, deny that it signifies *all men*. Both are extremely careful not to give this term an unlimited sense; knowing that, should they concede it, they admit that there is something in the scriptures, which warrants the doctrine of universal salvation. Now, it is an all-important point, to know what is signified by that term. If it do not mean *all men*, then we must acknowledge that the doctrine of universal holiness and consequent happiness is not urged in it;—but, if it do mean the whole human family, then it appears to be as plain a declaration as can possibly be made, that "*all men shall be made righteous.*"

As the correctness or incorrectness of our ideas concerning this text, is to be proved by the true signification of the word "many," it will be necessary for us to consult some acknowledged authority, to find the proper sense of the original, from which it is translated.

The Greek term rendered "many," in this text, is "*hoi polloi*," which signifies, says Packhurst, "*The many, i. e. the multitude or whole bulk of mankind.*" He refers us to Rom. v. 15, 19. "For if through the offence of one, *many* (*hoi polloi*) be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, abounded unto *many*, (*pollous*)." For the 19th see the head of this article. "In which texts," continues he *hoi polloi* are plainly equivalent to *pantas anthropos*, translated *all men*, as in verses 12 and 18. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon *all men*, (*pantas anthropos*) for that all have sinned." "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon *all men*, (*pantas anthropos*) to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came *upon all men*, (*pantas anthropos*) unto justification of life." He refers us, also, to Matt. xxvi. 28, where *many* is used, as being equivalent in the original, to "*all men*," or "*the whole bulk of mankind.*" "For this is my blood, which is shed for many, (or all men) for the remission of sin."

Thus he argues that *hoi polloi*, translated "many," is plainly equivalent to *pantas anthropos*, signifying *all men, the multitude or whole bulk of mankind.*" Hence he translates our text thus, in his Lexicon, page 165. "*For as by one man's disobedience, the many (or multitude) of mankind, hoi polloi, were made or constituted sinners; so by the obedience of one, shall the many (or multitude) of mankind, hoi polloi, be made or constituted righteous.*" Therefore, if Packhurst, (himself professing Calvinism,) give a correct definition of the terms;—those scriptures, upon which we can alone depend and which cannot lie, plainly prove, that *the whole family of mankind shall be made righteous*, through the obedience of Christ; and if righteous, they certainly must be happy also. Hence such as contend that the word *many* has not a universality of definition, are grossly in error, if our most learned and approved lexicographer, were correct. Let then, none hereafter say, that there is not even one verse in the bible, favoring the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness.

ORIGEN.

ELEGANT EXTRACT.

Give me to know that the doctrine of Jesus is bread from heaven, and that it sustains the spirit, and prepares it for heaven; and I may well be indifferent whether that bread descended, like the manna in the desert, in nightly dew, or whether, like the food of Elijah, it was brought to my eager hands by the ravens, or whether it was broken, for myself and the hungry thousands around me, by a hand endued with miraculous powers. So long as I know that it was sent me by the Father of my spirit, and that eating it I shall live forever, I know all that can give it value, or awaken my gratitude. When some friendly hand presses a cup of cold water to my lips, as I am fainting with thirst in a weary land, I will not ask, for I do not care, whether that water was showered from the skies, or whether it flowed in a river, or gushed from a spring. I ask not whether it was brought me in a golden urn, or whether it was presented in a chrysal vase, or a soldier's helmet. It is water that bids me live, and that is enough for me.—*Pierpont's Sermon.*

THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER
IS PUBLISHED EVERY OTHER SATURDAY MORNING,
AT No. 6, EXCHANGE-STREET,
BY RUSSELL STREETER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—One dollar per annum—payable at the end of six months. No paper discontinued until arrearages are settled.
TODD & SMITH.....PRINTERS.